

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-42 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 4-5, 11-12, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, claims 1-13, 18-37, and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. §102. The Examiner objected to claims 14-17 and 38 as being dependent upon rejected base claims. Applicant has amended claims 4, 11-12, 28, and 35, and has canceled claim 5. No new matter is introduced.

### **Section 112 Rejections**

Claims 4-5, 11-12, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to the terms “relevant” and “non-relevant” as being relative terms not defined by the claim or the specification. Applicant has canceled claim 5, and has deleted the word “non-relevant” from claim 4, 11-12, and 35. With these amendments, Applicant urges that claims 4, 11-12, and 35 are not indefinite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

### **Section 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-13, 18-37, and 39-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,725,424 (Schwerdtfeger, et al.).

The Examiner indicted that dependent claims 14-17 and 38 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of their base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for so indicating.

Applicant has amended independent claim 28 to incorporate subject matter of claims 37-38, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant urges that Schwerdtfeger does not disclose or suggest all limitations of amended claim 28, and that claim 28 is thus not anticipated by Schwerdtfeger. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicant urges that independent claims 1 and 29 are not anticipated by Schwerdtfeger for at least the reasons presented below.

At the very least, Applicant urges that Schwerdtfeger does not disclose or suggest *a method for filtering the documents comprising ... storing the input DOM; identifying elements of the input DOM that have previously been stored;* as essentially recited in claims 1 and 29.

Schwerdtfeger is directed to a system for delivering documents to client machines with limited resources, such as hand-held computers or wireless communication devices. Schwerdtfeger's system includes a interim server with a transcoder proxy with a DOM generator that in response to a client request for a document a pre-transcoded DOM that represents the original document. The DOM generator provides a first portion of the requested document to the transcoder which translates the document from one digital format to a second digital format that can be understood by the requesting client. The transcoder provides a script to the client that describes the elements within the first portion, including identifiers assigned to elements of the first portion. (Schwerdtfeger, col. 6, line 9 to col. 7, line 4.) There is, however, no disclosure or suggestion in the cited sections of Schwerdtfeger of a storage device coupled to the interim server, as recited in claim 29, or of storing the generated pre-transcoded DOM, as recited in claim 1, and identifying elements of the pre-transcoded DOM that have been previously stored, as recited in claim 1. Generating a DOM and providing a document to the transcoder does not disclose or suggest storing on input DOM, and disclosing identifiers assigned to elements of the first portion does not constitute *identifying elements of the input DOM that have previously been stored*, as suggested by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant urges that since Schwerdtfeger does not disclose or suggest all limitations of independent claims 1 and 29, Schwerdtfeger does not anticipate claims 1 and 29. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 6-12, 18-27, 30-33, and 35-41 all depend from either claims 1 or 29, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 29. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant urges that claims 1-2, 4, 6-33, and 35-42, as amended, are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated. Early and favorable action on this case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: David L. Heath Date: 1/29/07  
David L. Heath  
Reg. No. 46,763

**Mailing Address:**

F. Chau & Associates, LLP  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury NY 11797  
(516) 692-8888  
(516) 692-8889 (FAX)